<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 14, 15 and 17-21 are currently pending and will remain pending after the entry of this Amendment.

I. FORMAL MATTERS

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that the formal drawings filed on June 1, 2006 are accepted.

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgment of the claim to priority and indication that the certified copy of the priority document has been received.

Applicant notes with appreciation that the non-final office action includes a copy of the PTO Form SB/08 that was submitted in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on June 22, 2006. Each of the references cited therein is initialed by the Examiner, thereby indicating that these references have been considered and will be listed on the face of any patent that issues from the present invention.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 6, 8-10 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0179469 (Attar et al.). This rejection is traversed.

The Examiner has urged that paragraphs [0020] of <u>Attar et al.</u> discloses "time slots assigned to data for communication synchronized in time," and that paragraph

[0135] discloses that an access terminal and the user terminals are synchronized in time.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Paragraph [0020] of Attar et al. expressly discloses, "At each time-slot, data transmission occurs from an access point to one and only one access terminal...." This is in contrast to the present invention, in which the time-synchronous communication section transmits a time-synchronize communication frame to each communication station in a set of communication stations which includes a plurality of communication stations. Claim 1 recites that a set of communication stations and a type of a communication section is assigned to each of the time slots. Thus, in Attar et al. only one station is assigned a single time slot, while in the present invention a plurality of communication stations are assigned to a single time slot.

In addition, the Examiner asserts that paragraph [0135] of ATTAR et al. discloses "when the time-synchronous communication section transmits a time-synchronous communication frame to each communication station, time of the timer section of each communication station and the time slots of all communication stations are synchronized." Applicant respectfully submits that paragraph [0135] of Attar et al. merely discloses that the timing of the access points and access terminals is synchronized. Therefore, Attar et al. does not disclose the features of claim 1.

Further, the Examiner appears to reject the present claims based on only the disclosure that the communication station is synchronized. However, in the present invention, the time synchronous communication is assigned to the time slots, the time-synchronous communication frame is transmitted to each communication station, and the time slots of all communication stations are synchronized. Attar et al. fails to teach or suggest these features.

Therefore, since <u>Attar et al.</u> does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 1, 2, 6, 8-10 and 21 , <u>Attar et al.</u> does not anticipate claims 1, 2, 6, 8-10 and 21. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 2, 6, 8-10 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over ATTAR in view of U.S. 2003/0110435 (<u>Wu et al.</u>). This rejection is traversed.

<u>Wu et al.</u> has been cited for teaching transmission of ACK and NACK messages based on packet delivery but, like <u>Attar et al.</u> discussed above, fails to disclose e.g., each time slot having a plurality of communication stations assigned to it, as recited in claim 1, from which claims 3-4 depend, as presented above.

Claims 7, 11, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over ATTAR in view of USP 6,021,124 (<u>Haarsten</u>) further in view of US 2004/0062278 (<u>Hadzic</u>). This rejection is traversed.

<u>Haarsten</u> has been cited for teaching that a "go-back-n ARQ" method is employed in which a data packet is stored and the corresponding time is recorded, and <u>Hadzic</u> has been cited for teaching timestamps attached to packets, but neither cited reference teaches, mentions or suggests the features of claim 1, from which claims 7, 11, 14 and 15 depend, as presented above.

Claims 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over ATTAR in view of USP 5,541,919 (<u>Yong</u>). This rejection is traversed.

<u>Yong</u> has been cited for teaching a plurality of buffers are used for different services but, like <u>Attar et al.</u> discussed above, fails to teach, mention or suggest the features recited in claim 1, as presented above, from which claims 17-20 depend.

Therefore, the cited and applied prior art references, either alone or in combination, do not form the invention defined by claims 3, 4, 7, 11, 14, 15 and 17-20. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 3, 4, 7, 11, 14, 15 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

<u>Conclusion</u>

Applicants submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney for Applicants if such communication is deemed to expedite prosecution of this application.

If any payments are required, please deduct them from deposit account no. 141449, reference number 109601-65812.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 27, 2009

/John J. Penny, Jr./
John J. Penny, Jr., Reg. No. : 36,984
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Customer No. 21125
Nutter McClennen & Fish LLP
World Trade Center West
155 Seaport Boulevard
Boston, MA 02210
Tel: (617) 439-2550
Fax: (617) 310-9550